ADE & COMPANY PATENT AND TRADEMARK AGENTS

ADRIAN D. BATTISON, B.Sc., F.P.T.I.C Michael R. Williams, B.Sc., Ph.D., A.P.T.I.C. RYAN W. DUPUIS, B. Sc., A.P.T.I.C.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER NOV 2 5 2004

> 1700-360 Main Street Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada R3C 3Z3

Telephone (204)947- 1429 Facsimile (204) 942-5723 E-Mail: info@adeco.com

Our File: 85279-102/RWD

FACSIMILE COVER LETTER

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING	DAGES TO:
	1-703-872-9306
FROM:	Ryan W. Dupuis
TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUD	NG THIS COVER LETTER:4
DATE:	November 25, 2004
TELEPHONE:(204) 947-1429	FACSIMILE: (204) 942-5723
OPERATOR:	HEATHER KIRKPATRICK
CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT	E MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSONAL AND IS NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT ILLE FOR DELIVERING IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE

HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS DOCUMENT IN ERROR, AND THAT ANY REVIEW, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US BY MAIL.

RE: United States Patent Application no: 10/724,699 Filed December 2, 2003

> Kit and Method for Truck Cab Conversion EXAMINER -Kiran B. Patel GROUP 3612

Response/amendment to Notice of Action dated and a request for a 1 MONTH extension of time in duplicate.

IF ALL PAGES ARE NOT RECEIVED OR ANY ARE NOT LEGIBLE. PLEASE CALL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NUV 2 5 2004

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: 85279-102/RWD

EXAMINER

Kiran B. Patel

GROUP

3612

APPLICANT

Darryl Budge

SERIAL NO:

10/724,699

FILED

December 2, 2003

FOR

Kit and Method for Truck Cab Conversion

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office 2011 South Clark Place Customer Window, Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03 Arlington, Virginia 22202 U.S.A.

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Notice of Action dated October 26, 2004

REMARKS:

In response to the requirement for restriction, the applicant provisionally elects the Examiner's Group II, Claims 15 through 20 drawn to a kit. Reconsideration of the requirement for restriction however is respectfully requested. The restriction between Groups I and II is therefore traversed.

Having considered the Examiner's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Groups I and II are not distinct in the manner suggested. First the Examiner states that the invention relates to a process of making and a product made in accordance with section 806.05(f) of MPEP. This however is incorrect as the process according to claim 1 does not result in